UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,607	10/23/2001	Lino Tavares	208.1004US	1029
7590 10/24/2007 Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC			EXAMINER	
14th Floor	••	GHALI, ISIS A D		
485 Seventh Avenue New York, NY 10018			ART UNIT	PAPER NÜMBER
1,0,1,1,1,1			1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/045,607	TAVARES ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Isis A. Ghali	1615	

The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the co	rrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 October 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or this application, applicant must timely file one of the fol places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a l a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complia- time periods:	on the same day as filing a Notice of A lowing replies: (1) an amendment, affic Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in coance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mus	ppeal. To avoid abandonment of lavit, or other evidence, which ompliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mai		a dia dia dia dia dalam and takan da lakan da			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of thin no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPER	re later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 2706.07(f).	date of the final rejection. FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lathay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704 NOTICE OF APPEAL	extension and the corresponding amount one shortened statutory period for reply originater than three months after the mailing date	f the fee. The appropriate extension fee hally set in the final Office action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 October 2007</u>. A the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any re AMENDMENTS)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejectio They raise new issues that would require further 	n, but prior to the date of filing a brief, consideration and/or search (see NOT	will <u>not</u> be entered because E below);			
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE begin to be application in appeal; and/or 	better form for appeal by materially red				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a	a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR		npliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	n(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s).					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed amendment(s): The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 8-11,13,14,16,20,22-24,29,30,32-38 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	provided below or appended.	be entered and an explanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		Manager and the second			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:					
	ISIS GHALI PRIMARY EXAMINER	Isis A Ghali Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1615			

Claims 8-11, 13, 14,16, 20-24, 29, 30, 32,38, and 40-49 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,910,205 ('205) combined with US 5,968,547 ('547) because the invention as a whole is taught by the combined teaching of the references. The amendment made to the claims to recite the expression "consisting essentially of" limits the scope of the claim to the specified ingredients, and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the composition. *In re Janakirama-Rao*, 317 F 2d 951, 137 USPQ 893 (CCPA 1963). When applicant contends that modifying components in the reference's composition are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of", applicant has the burden of showing the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed composition, i.e. showing that the introduction of these components would materially change the characteristics of applicant's composition. *In re De Lajarte*, 337 F 2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964).